

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Applicants have canceled claims 15, 19, 24-27, and 32-35, and amended claims 11 and 17 as suggested by the Examiner during the interview of June 14, 2005. The amendment adds no new matter.

Substance of Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Interview held on June 14, 2005. The outstanding rejections in this application were discussed. Applicants argued that adequate written description support for the pending claims could be found in the specification. The Examiner agreed that claims 11, 17, 20-23, and 28-31 were allowable, but suggested amending claims 11 and 17 to recite that the antibody "specifically" binds to the antigen of interest to avoid any potential ambiguities. The Examiner further agreed that that he would consider withdrawing the written description rejection of claims 15, 19, 24-27, and 32-35, but indicated that the utility rejection of these claims would be maintained.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 for lacking utility

Claims 15, 19, 24-27, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 101 and 112 as allegedly not being supported by either a specific asserted utility or a well-established utility.

Applicants traverse the rejection. Applicants' claimed immune complexes have a well-established utility, namely, they can be used to generate immune responses. The Examiner has not asserted that applicants' immune complexes could not be used in this well-established utility. There is no reason to believe that applicants' immune

complexes could not be used to induce immune responses. Accordingly, the rejection of applicants' claimed immune complexes for lacking utility is improper.

Nevertheless, solely to expedite allowance of this application, applicants have canceled claims 15, 19, 24-27, and 32-34. Thus, the rejection is moot.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph,
for lacking an adequate written description**

Claims 11, 15, 17, 19, and 20-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicants traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth in applicants' July 16, 2004, Response. As pointed out by applicants during the interview with the Examiner, the pending claims are fully supported by the specification. Nevertheless, solely to expedite allowance of this application, applicants have canceled claims 15, 19, 24-27, and 32-35. **The Examiner agreed during the interview on June 14, 2005, that applicants' specification supported claims 11, 17, 20-23, and 28-31, and that they were allowable.**

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 26, 2005

By: _____


Salvatore J. Arrigo
Reg. No. 46,063
Telephone: 202-408-4160
Facsimile: 202-408-4400
E-mail: arrigos@finnegan.com